

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STA	ATES DEPARTMENT	OKC	MIC	MERCI
United States	S Patent and Tradema	ark Qf	Tice	
	MISSIONER FOR PAT	EN12/	\ 1	[
Alexan	dria, Virginia 22313-1450	- 1	\	ι.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/619,072	07/14/2003	George R. Royer		69/9	
759	90 07/27/2004		EXAM	INER	
George R. Roy	er		PELHAM, JOS	EPH MOORE	
Suite 416					
316 N. Michigan Street		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Toledo, OH 43624		3742			

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/619,072	ROYER, GEORGE R				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Joseph M Pelham	3742				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	ſ.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the E	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					

Art Unit: 3742

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 3 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6593550. This is a double patenting rejection.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6593550. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims merely broaden slightly the patented claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for thermally conductive ring element, does not reasonably provide enablement for "non-radiant" and "radiant" surfaces. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Further, at line 5, "circumferential surface" should evidently be "circumferential surfaces".

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 3, text is missing from the last line.

In claim 4, text is missing from line 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 3960134 to Scott. See especially Figures 7-13, column 3, lines 6-10, lines 48-49, and column 4, lines 3-5.

The prior art cited but not applied is pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The examiner urges, for the sake of expedient prosecution, that the prior art listed in the Form PTO-892 but not applied be considered with the previously cited prior art when responding to this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Joseph Pelham, at (703)308-1709. Status inquiries of a general nature should be directed to the Technology Center 3700 receptionist at (703) 308-0861.

Joseph Pelham Primary Patent Examiner

Art Unit 3742

JP 7/26/04